

Comment on
“Gravitationally Induced Neutrino-Oscillation Phases”

Tanmoy Bhattacharya¹, Salman Habib², and Emil Mottola¹

¹*Theoretical Division
T-8, MS B285
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, NM 87545*

²*Theoretical Division
T-DOT, MS B288
Los Alamos National Laboratory
Los Alamos, NM 87545*

Abstract

We critically examine the recent claim of a “new effect” of gravitationally induced quantum mechanical phases in neutrino oscillations. A straightforward exercise in the Schwarzschild coordinates appropriate to a spherically symmetric non-rotating star shows that, although there is a general relativistic effect of the star’s gravity on neutrino oscillations, it is not of the form claimed, and is too small to be measured.

In a recent communication [1], Ahluwalia and Burgard claim to have discovered a “new effect from an hitherto unexplored interplay of gravitation and the principle of the linear superposition of quantum mechanics.” In fact, the calculation of the quantum mechanical phase of a particle propagating in the geometry of a collapsed star appears in several textbooks on general relativity [2]. More importantly, the claimed results in equations (6) to (8) of Ref. [1] appear to be at variance with the standard treatment, which we review in this Comment. The gravitational correction to the phase turns out to be of order 10^{-9} for neutrinos in the eV mass range and is therefore completely negligible for situations of astrophysical interest.

In the geometrical optics limit the quantum mechanical phase accumulated by a particle propagating from point A to point B in the gravitational field described by the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ is given by the classical action of the particle, divided by $\hbar$, namely,

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_A^B m ds = \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_A^B p_\mu dx^\mu = \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_A^B (-E dt + p_i dx^i) \quad (1)$$

where p_μ is the four momentum conjugate to x^μ :

$$p_\mu = m g_{\mu\nu} \frac{dx^\nu}{ds} , \quad (2)$$

and ds is an element of proper length of the particle’s worldline. The integrand of Eqn. (1) is obviously an invariant under coordinate transformations. However, the form of the integral will depend on the labeling of the end-points A and B. Equation (1) is the same as the Eqn. (4) of Ref. [1] with which those authors begin.

The authors of Ref. [1] address the radial propagation of relativistic neutrinos in the potential of a spherically symmetric non-rotating star which is described by the Schwarzschild line element

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right) dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 + r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2 \theta d\phi^2) . \quad (3)$$

We note that the semiclassical phase for radial motion in a spherically symmetric background does not depend on the spin of the particle, as can be verified by explicit calculation using the spin connection in the Dirac equation in this background [3]. Hence Eqn. (1) applies equally well to neutrinos

as to scalar particles in the case of radial motion. Because the spacetime has a time-like Killing vector, $\partial/\partial t$, the momentum conjugate to it is time independent:

$$E \equiv -p_t = m \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right) \frac{dt}{ds} = \text{constant} . \quad (4)$$

The value of this constant E is the asymptotic energy of the neutrino at $r = \infty$. For radial motion, the mass shell constraint reads

$$g^{\mu\nu} p_\mu p_\nu + m^2 = 0 = - \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^{-1} E^2 + \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right) p_r^2 + m^2 , \quad (5)$$

from which we obtain

$$p_r \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right) = \sqrt{E^2 - m^2 + \frac{2GMm^2}{r}} . \quad (6)$$

Making use of the definitions (2)

$$p_r = m \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^{-1} \frac{dr}{ds} , \quad (7)$$

and (4), we can write

$$\frac{dt}{dr} = \left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^{-2} \frac{E}{p_r} . \quad (8)$$

We regard the Schwarzschild radial coordinates r_A and r_B as fixed and express the phase Φ in those coordinates as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{r_A}^{r_B} \left(-E \frac{dt}{dr} + p_r \right) dr \\ &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{r_A}^{r_B} \left[-\frac{E^2}{\left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)^2} + p_r^2 \right] \frac{dr}{p_r} \\ &= -\frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{r_A}^{r_B} \frac{m^2 dr}{\left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right) p_r} \\ &= -\frac{m^2}{\hbar} \int_{r_A}^{r_B} \frac{dr}{\sqrt{E^2 - m^2 + \frac{2GMm^2}{r}}} . \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

This is just the standard result [2]. In the weak field approximation, we expand this result to first order in G , to obtain

$$\Phi \simeq -\frac{m^2}{\hbar\sqrt{E^2 - m^2}}(r_B - r_A) + \frac{GMm^4}{\hbar(E^2 - m^2)^{3/2}} \ln\left(\frac{r_B}{r_A}\right) + \dots \quad (10)$$

The precise application of the above formula depends on the physical situation at hand, specifically, on what variables are to be held fixed in a particular interference experiment.

Let us consider the case of neutrinos produced at fixed asymptotic energy E in a weak flavor eigenstate that is a linear superposition of mass eigenstates, m_1 and m_2 . Since the energy is fixed but the masses are different, if interference is to be observed at the same final spacetime point (r_B, t_B) , the relevant components of the wave function could not both have started from the same initial spacetime point (r_A, t_A) in the semiclassical approximation. Instead the lighter mass (hence faster moving) component must either have started at the same time from a spatial location $r < r_A$, or (what is equivalent) started from the same location r_A at a later time $t_A + \Delta t$. Hence, there is already an initial phase difference between the two mass components due to this time lag, even before the transport from r_A to r_B which leads to the phase Φ in (9). The additional initial phase difference may be taken into account most conveniently from the second point of view, *i.e.* by treating the spatial coordinates r_A and r_B as fixed and the time of transit,

$$\int_A^B dt = \int_{r_A}^{r_B} \frac{dt}{dr} dr \quad (11)$$

as the dependent variable through Eqns. (6) and (8). The difference of this time of transit between the two mass eigenstates, multiplied by E is precisely the additional phase, $E\Delta t$ which we must add to $\Delta\Phi$ to obtain the correct relative phase between the two mass components of the wave function which interfere at (r_B, t_B) with fixed energy E . We note that the COW experiment [4] may be treated by similar reasoning and that many other scenarios for neutrino oscillations which may be envisaged lead to the same result.

Hence we are led to compute instead of Φ , the quantity,

$$\Phi_r = \Phi + E \int_A^B dt = \int_A^B p_r dr \quad (12)$$

This Φ_r may be calculated just as easily as the full Φ :

$$\Phi_r = \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_A^B \frac{\sqrt{E^2 - m^2 + \frac{2GMm^2}{r}}}{\left(1 - \frac{2GM}{r}\right)} dr. \quad (13)$$

In the weak field expansion this becomes,

$$\Phi_r \simeq \frac{1}{\hbar} \sqrt{E^2 - m^2} \left[(r_B - r_A) + 2GM \ln \left(\frac{r_B}{r_A} \right) \right] + \frac{GMm^2}{\hbar \sqrt{E^2 - m^2}} \ln \left(\frac{r_B}{r_A} \right) + \dots \quad (14)$$

The relative phase difference $\Delta\Phi_r$ between two mass eigenstates of relativistic neutrinos ($E^2 \gg m^2$) with mass squared difference of Δm^2 created at point r_A and interfering at point r_B is then

$$\Delta\Phi_r \simeq \frac{(\Delta m^2)c^3}{2\hbar E} (r_B - r_A) + \frac{(\Delta m^4)c^7}{4\hbar E^3} (r_B - r_A) - \frac{(\Delta m^4)c^5}{2\hbar E^3} GM \ln \left(\frac{r_B}{r_A} \right) + \dots, \quad (15)$$

where c has been restored to facilitate numerical calculations. We note that in the relativistic limit this result is precisely minus half of the equivalent quantity computed from the full phase Φ . The first term ($\Delta\Phi_r^0$) in Eqn. (15) is the standard flat space result, well known in both neutrino and strangeness oscillations. The leading order correction to this familiar result has cancelled in the relativistic limit and we are left only with the latter higher order terms in Eqn. (15). The second term is the special relativistic correction to the phase which is usually neglected for light neutrinos, and the last term is the effect of the gravitational field of the star in static Schwarzschild coordinates which enters only at the same higher order in $1/E^3$. Numerically its magnitude is equal to

$$3.74 \times 10^{-9} \left(\frac{M}{M_\odot} \right) \left(\frac{\Delta m^4}{\text{eV}^4} \right) \left(\frac{\text{MeV}}{E} \right)^3 \ln \left(\frac{r_B}{r_A} \right) \quad (16)$$

which is completely negligible in typical astrophysical applications.

We note more generally that for the case of radial motion in coordinates such that $g_{rt} = 0$, the expression for the phase, Eqn. (1), can be written as

$$\Phi = -\frac{m^2}{\hbar} \int_A^B \frac{dr_{\text{local}}}{p_{\text{local}}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar} \int_A^B \frac{dt_{\text{local}}}{E_{\text{local}}} \\
&= -\frac{m^2 c^4}{\hbar} T_{AB} \left(\frac{1}{E_{\text{local}}} \right)_{av}
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
dr_{\text{local}} &= \sqrt{g_{rr}} dr \\
dt_{\text{local}} &= \sqrt{-g_{tt}} dt \\
p_{\text{local}} &= p_r / \sqrt{g_{rr}} \\
E_{\text{local}} &= E / \sqrt{-g_{tt}} \quad \text{and} \\
T_{AB} &= \int_A^B dt_{\text{local}}
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

which is a statement of the equivalence principle. Locally there are no observable effects of the gravitational potential. The redshifted energy E_{local} is not a constant of motion and cannot be pulled outside of integrals, which accounts for the appearance of $(1/E_{\text{local}})_{av} = (1/T_{AB}) \int_A^B dt_{\text{local}}/E_{\text{local}}$ in the above expression.

The authors of Ref. [1] claim to find an effect on the phase, first order in G^1 , equal to (Eqn. (8) of Ref. [1])

$$\frac{GMc}{\hbar} \left[\int_A^B \frac{dr}{r} \right] \frac{\Delta m^2}{E} . \tag{19}$$

However no derivation is given to support this claim and their quantity E is never defined. If E is the constant of the motion defined in Eqn. (4), then this claim disagrees with the standard result (15) rederived here, and is therefore incorrect. On the other hand, if E is to be identified with our E_{local} , then it cannot be pulled out of the integral, and (19) is incorrect for that reason.

¹Actually the phase quoted in Ref. [1] Eqn. (6) differs from the one obtained by us by a factor of two, even in flat space, because $\Delta\Phi_r$ enters interference probabilities through $\cos(\Delta\Phi_r)$ whereas their Eqn. (6) contains $\sin^2$ of a phase angle which should be $\Delta\Phi_r/2$ by the half-angle formula. This discrepancy may have arisen from a confusion between Φ and Φ_r which also differ by a factor of $-\frac{1}{2}$, as noted previously.

There is a sense in which the *first* ($\Delta\Phi_r^0$) term of Eqn. (15) has a contribution similar in form to (19). If we define

$$\bar{E}_{\text{local}} = \frac{1}{r_B - r_A} \int_B^A \frac{E dr}{\sqrt{1 - \frac{2GM}{r}}}, \quad (20)$$

then in the weak field limit,

$$\bar{E}_{\text{local}} \simeq E + \frac{EGM}{r_B - r_A} \ln\left(\frac{r_B}{r_A}\right) \quad (21)$$

and we can write

$$\Delta\Phi_r^0 \simeq \frac{\Delta m^2 c^3}{2\hbar \bar{E}_{\text{local}}} (r_B - r_A) + \frac{\Delta m^2 GM c}{2\bar{E}_{\text{local}}} \ln\left(\frac{r_B}{r_A}\right) \quad (22)$$

which is of the form reported in Ref. [1]. However, to interpret this rewriting of the standard result in different variables as a “new” gravitational effect would be very misleading. The quantity $\bar{E}_{\text{local}}$ refers to the energy measured by local observers at fixed r and differs from the asymptotic E precisely because of the well known gravitational redshift effect of general relativity. Since all measuring rods and clocks are subject to the *same* redshift, there are no physical consequences of this local redshift effect on the observable physics of neutrino oscillations (for example, if along with the local energy one uses the proper, rather than the coordinate, length, then the “effect” in (22) disappears). In particular, any effect(s) of neutrino oscillations on energy transport and heating in supernova explosions are quite indifferent to such local redefinitions of length, time and energy scales. Provided all calculations are done in a relativistically covariant framework, local redshift effects are accounted for automatically and there are no observable consequences for supernova evolution to be deduced from the decomposition in (22). Of course, if one does *not* use a relativistically covariant framework in the calculations, the error made will be precisely of the order of the second term in (22).

The only indication of the basis for the claim in Ref. [1] is a reference to a paper by Stodolsky [5]. However, as Stodolsky himself notes, the split between “flat” and “curved” space effects in equation (2.3) of his paper is coordinate dependent. Hence there is no invariant meaning to the splitting of the phase into these two pieces, and such a splitting is completely misleading for the present application, just as is the splitting of $\Delta\Phi_r^0$ into the two pieces

in (22) above. In addition, the time component of the quantity Stodolsky calls the “usual four-momentum of special relativity” is not a constant of motion in the present application and cannot be removed from integrals over r . Since Stodolsky starts with precisely the same phase Φ of Eqn. (1) the *sum* of his two pieces is precisely equal to the same result (9) rederived here, as may be checked directly from the definitions in Ref. [5].

Finally we note that the gravitational effect which we have computed here in (16) has a different dependence on the neutrino masses and energy from the flat space result, $\Delta\Phi_r^0$, and hence it cannot be absorbed into $\Delta\Phi_r^0$ by a coordinate transformation.

References

- [1] D. V. Ahluwalia and C. Burgard, gr-qc/9603008, First prize essay in the 1996 Awards for Essays on Gravitation by the Gravity Research Foundation.
- [2] C. W. Misner, K. S. Thorne and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation*, (Freeman, San Francisco, 1973), Box 25.4B, p. 649; L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *The Classical Theory of Fields*, (Pergamon, Oxford, 1985), page 306.
- [3] D. R. Brill and J. A. Wheeler, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **29**, 465 (1957).
- [4] R. Colella, A. W. Overhauser, and S. A. Werner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34**, 1472 (1975); A. W. Overhauser and R. Colella, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **33**, 1237 (1974).
- [5] L. Stodolsky, *Gen. Rel. and Grav.* **11**, 391 (1979).